DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 998 EA 011 722

AUTHOR Thompson, Sydney

TITLE Motivation of Teachers. ACSA School Management Digest, Series 1, Number 18. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number 46.
INSTITUTION Association of California School Administrators.; Oregon Univ., Eugene. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
CONTRACT 400-78-0007
NOTE 50p.
AVAILABLE FROM Association of California School Administrators, 1575 Old Bayshore Highway, Burlingame, CA 94010 ($3.50; $2.75 for ACSA members)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Rewards; *Teacher Motivation; *Theories; *Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS Information Analysis Products

ABSTRACT

This publication discusses intrinsic teacher motivation by reviewing human resources literature and making use of educational literature and interviews with working educators. First it provides sketches of the work motivation theories of McGregor, Maslow, Herzberg, and Deci. Next, the paper examines the work and problems of teachers. Finally, it offers a review of strategies for enhancing the motivation of teachers, such as praising and providing feedback. The paper concludes that administrators should accept teachers as partners in a collective pursuit. They should seek to ease the frustrations of teaching and encourage teachers' effectiveness and achievement of psychic rewards. (Author/LD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178998

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MOTIVATION OF TEACHERS

Sydney Thompson

Prepared by
ERIC Clearinghouse on
Educational Management

Published by
Association of California
School Administrators

EA 011 722

ACSA School Management Digest, Number Eighteen
ERIC/CEM Accession Number: EA 011 722
ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number Forty-Six

Printed in the United States of America, 1979
Association of California School Administrators
1575 Old Bayshore Highway
Burlingame, California 94010

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Association of California School Administrators for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Association of California School Administrators or the National Institute of Education.

CONTENTS

Foreword	v
Introduction: Motivation or Manipulation?	1
Theories of Work Motivation	4
McGregor's Two Motivational Relationships and Two Views of Human Nature	4
Maslow's Theory of Motivation	6
Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory	8
The Incompatibility of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Rewards	11
The Work Situation of Teachers	14
Strategies for Enhancing the Motivation of Teachers	20
Praising and Encouraging	21
Honoring	22
Setting Goals	23
Providing Feedback	25
Stimulating Teachers	26
Improving Teachers' Professional and Personal Effectiveness	27
Increasing Teachers' Control over Their Work	29
Promoting Collaborative Relations	32
Differentiating Extrinsic Rewards	33
Enriching Teachers' Work	35
Conclusion	37
Bibliography	38
Interviews	44

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. ERIC serves the educational community by disseminating educational research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several clearinghouses in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse and its companion units process research reports and journal articles for announcement in ERIC's index and abstract bulletins.

Research reports are announced in *Resources in Education (RIE)*, available in many libraries and by subscription for $42.70 a year from the United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Most of the documents listed in *RIE* can be purchased through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, operated by Computer Microfilm International Corporation.

Journal articles are announced in *Current Index to Journals in Education. CIJE* is also available in many libraries and can be ordered for $75 a year (plus postage and handling) from Oryx Press, 3930 East Camelback Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85018. Semiannual cumulations can be ordered separately.

Besides processing documents and journal articles, the Clearinghouse has another major function—information analysis and synthesis. The Clearinghouse prepares bibliographies, literature reviews, state-of-the-knowledge papers, and other interpretive research studies on topics in its educational area.

FOREWORD

Both the Association of California School Administrators and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management are pleased to cooperate in producing the *School Management Digest*, a series of reports designed to offer educational leaders essential information on a wide range of critical concerns in education.

At a time when decisions in education must be made on the basis of increasingly complex information, the *Digest* provides school administrators with concise, readable analyses of the most important trends in schools today, as well as points up the practical implications of major research findings.

By special cooperative arrangement, the series draws on the extensive research facilities and expertise of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. The titles in the series were planned and developed cooperatively by both organizations. Utilizing the resources of the ERIC network, the Clearinghouse is responsible for researching the topics and preparing the copy for publication by ACSA.

The author of this report, Sydney Thompson, was commissioned by the Clearinghouse as a research analyst and writer.

Ron Stewart
President
ACSA

Philip K. Piele
Director
ERIC/CEM

INTRODUCTION: MOTIVATION OR MANIPULATION?

What motivates teachers? How can schools enhance teacher motivation? These questions seem simple enough, but they are not easily resolved. Once we question the common wisdom and inquire further, we find problems and uncertainties. Educators have little to say about teacher motivation, and much of what they do say is misguided. Their writings seldom show much critical awareness. Most often they give untested common-sense guidelines for enhancing motivation or repeat without question the conclusions of a few major theorists.

We are forced to look elsewhere for help. The literature of management and organizational psychology can provide a more substantial base for a discussion of teacher motivation. Here work motivation is a major issue pursued with rigor and controversy. But this literature presents a problem of its own. Since it addresses industrial and business concerns, its conclusions may not always fit the needs of schools and teachers. A thoughtless mating can breed monsters, so we must be cautious in applying management literature to education.

To discuss work motivation is to raise some serious questions of value. All organizational research, as Argyris writes, is value-laden. Studies that seek only to describe and predict work behavior under existing conditions may seem value free, but they actually make value judgments simply by accepting the present social universe as a given. Nord tells us that even the most progressive management theory is weakened by its failure to question the social and cultural milieu that shapes organizations. Research that looks at the present situation uncritically can easily confuse what is and what can and ought to be.

All discussions of work motivation raise the issue of how we treat our fellows, but few directly confront it. Whether dressed in technical language or common talk, many proposed strategies for motivation seem Machiavellian schemes for using people to one's own gain. Most emphasize the manipulation of workers through external rewards and punishments to raise productivity. The usual phrasing of the question—"How can we increase workers'

motivation?"—invites this, for it silently ignores ends and reduces the issue to one of means. In our technological society, as Bowers charges, questions of human value are sidestepped or deformed into questions of practical value. Few discussions about motivation seem to consider the fact that workers are fellow humans and partners in a common enterprise.

For Herzberg (1968), the use of direct reward and punishment for motivation, demanded by common management thought, amounts to seduction and rape. Thurman similarly finds common suggestions for increasing job satisfaction to be manipulative and paternalistic ploys. He points critically to the frequently given advice that managers can improve satisfaction and productivity by merely changing their surface style. Such advice usually encourages managers to be both more open to communication and participation and more efficiency-minded at the same time. But this view, he warns, rests on the risky assumption that workers are more concerned with managerial style than with the substance of their work and its benefits.

But a concern with motivation need not lead to manipulation. A major school of management thought counters manipulative views of motivation with one that is humane and vital. The "human resources" school, as Sergiovanni (1977) describes it, confronts the value issues of motivation and argues that worker fulfillment and productivity are to be reached together through an integration of the needs of workers and organizations. Organizational health, human resources theorists stress, requires work that challenges and fulfills, work that stimulates intrinsic motivation—the desire to complete work for its own value, not for external rewards. An organizational environment that encourages fulfillment and growth, they conclude, can draw forth workers' maximum effort and potential.

Our major task, then, will be to work out strategies for enhancing teacher motivation that serve the needs of teachers and avoid manipulation. For guidance, we will rely heavily on human resources literature and also make some use of educational literature and interviews with working educators from two Eugene, Oregon, school systems. Our goal is the improvement of practice, but we must first ground action in theory. We will first review human resources literature to sketch out a theory of work motivation and counter common destructive views, next examine the work and problems of teachers, and conclude with a tentative

review of motivational strategies.

Throughout the discussion, we will emphasize intrinsic motivation, inseparable from the service task of teaching, whose principal aim and reward are helping others grow. We will also reach out to understand a wide range of motivational influences. Motivation is not a matter of a few clear-cut strategies: it depends on the whole of teachers' work and their schools. As one elementary school principal, Herman Schwartzrock, advised when interviewed, motivating teachers means both removing blocks to effective teaching and actively supporting their efforts: in essence, it is a task of enabling teachers to teach at their best.

THEORIES OF WORK MOTIVATION

Psychologists offer a variety of contradictory explanations of motivation and behavior in general and work motivation in particular. Their views can be radically opposed: behaviorists, at one extreme, ignore the spirit of human beings and look to external events as determinants of behavior; Jungian psychologists, at the other extreme, emphasize human spiritual, but largely unconscious, self-realization and tend to ignore external events. Both views, we might add, stand opposed to the common-sense view of motivation: it is generally assumed that people make conscious rational choices to maximize pleasure and minimize pain.

In the midst of such diversity of thought, any discussion of motivation must touch on many unresolved theoretical issues. This discussion, necessarily brief, will have to pass over many of these issues, as it simplifies and accepts as generally true what is still open to debate. We will establish a general approach to work motivation through reviews of the work of McGregor, Maslow, and Herzberg—the three theorists who have exerted the greatest influence on educational literature—and the work of Deci, important for his research on intrinsic motivation.

McGregor's Two Motivational Relationships and Two Views of Human Nature

The work of McGregor, a major human resources theorist, sets out the basic problems of work motivation and provides us with a suitable beginning. Work motivation, he explains, depends on the interaction of both outside and inside, both environmental and individual characteristics. Motivating people thus means creating relationships between these two realms that encourage productive effort. We typically talk of the important environmental factors that influence effort in terms of rewards and punishments. We similarly speak of the important individual factors as basic human needs, though we must also consider individual capabilities, goals, expectations, and attitudes.

Managers, McGregor continues, can follow two basic approaches to motivation that create different relationships

between rewards and punishments and human needs. One approach uses extrinsic or external rewards and punishments. These belong to the environment of work rather than to the work itself and include money, fringe benefits, praise, recognition, promotion, criticism, social acceptance, and social rejection. A second approach uses intrinsic rewards. These derive from the work itself and include helping others and achievements of knowledge, skill, autonomy, and self-respect. Extrinsic rewards serve basic needs for physical survival, security, and social interaction and some higher-level needs for ego satisfaction and growth. Intrinsic rewards alone can satisfy many of a person's ego needs.

McGregor complains that management has relied heavily on extrinsic rewards and punishment to motivate and control workers, but has paid much less attention to intrinsic rewards, despite their important impact on work satisfaction and productivity. He finds two reasons for this failure to use intrinsic rewards. First, management cannot manipulate intrinsic rewards as easily as it can extrinsic rewards; it can only create conditions that make their attainment more likely. Second, and most important, management has traditionally acted on a view of human nature that undermines the value of intrinsic rewards.

The traditional view, which McGregor terms Theory X, assumes at once a mechanistic and negative image of human nature. According to this view, people are naturally inert and without initiative or desire to assume responsibility. What motivation they do have is contrary to the demands of organized work and is expended in play or in destructive activities. This limited view argues that organizations must exercise external controls to coerce their unwilling workers to produce.

McGregor offers an alternative view of human nature, which he finds supported by recent developments in behavioral science. According to this view, which he terms Theory Y, people are neither inert nor mechanical beings; they are instead dynamic and organic beings, naturally self-activated. Their motives need not be antithetical to work; they can be released in productive work as well as in play or destruction. Given the opportunity, people will pursue at work goals associated with higher-level needs for autonomy, self-respect, responsibility, achievement, and the use and development of their talents.

The recognition of such productive potential demands from

management an emphasis not on coercive controls, but on the restructuring of work so that workers can realize their needs on the job. The key principle becomes that of integrating worker and organizational goals. Management must create work conditions, McGregor states, such that "members of the organization at all levels can best achieve their own goals by directing their efforts toward the goals of the organization."

If we accept McGregor's Theory Y, we may wonder how management could be so wrong in its view of human nature. But we must understand that both Theory X and Theory Y management are self-fulfilling: management strategies fashion people to fit their preconceived images. Managers who assume workers must be coerced and who consequently create a controlling and restrictive work environment subvert rather than release workers' higher needs and encourage them to act out Theory X assumptions.

In a review of organizational research, Argyris provides a helpful illustration of the self-fulfilling nature of Theory X. The research, he states, shows that formally structured, controlling organizations, characterized by such qualities as formalization of rules, specialization of tasks, and authoritarian leadership, tend to limit workers to an infant level of expression, increasing their dependence and submissiveness and decreasing their autonomy and use of talents. Workers in such organizations, to the extent they seek to express themselves as adults by exercising their autonomy and using their talents, "may adapt by reactions ranging from absenteeism to withdrawal and noninvolvement, aggression, an increased emphasis on instrumental rewards, and a decreasing emphasis on intrinsic rewards."

Maslow's Theory of Motivation

McGregor's view of human nature and motivation relies heavily on the work of Maslow, and a discussion of human resources theory demands a look at Maslow's seminal work. Maslow, a major figure in the development of humanistic psychology, affirms people's higher natures and emphasizes their positive strivings. His theory of needs provides, in his own terms, a necessary addition to the classical psychologies of behaviorism and psychoanalysis, which tend to limit humans to their lower needs.

Maslow paints a dynamic image of human beings, in which they are never fully satisfied, but always seeking to gratify new wants as part of their instinctual thrust to self-fulfillment. Their behavior is generally determined by a few basic needs, which arrange themselves into a hierarchy of prepotency or priority. Lower, more prepotent, needs take precedence and must receive satisfaction before other and higher needs come into play. Until a basic need is gratified, it dominates and organizes the personality, providing a goal that directs behavior. Once it receives satisfaction, it loses its importance and hold on the personality, and higher needs emerge to organize the personality. This general progression from lower to higher needs can be broken if a once-satisfied need meets deprivation, at which point it will again come into prominence and dominate the personality.

Maslow's hierarchy comprises five basic need categories. Physiological needs, the most prepotent, include needs of hunger, thirst, and sex, as well as such others as needs for activity and stimulation. Safety needs, next in potency, include needs for security, stability, protection, structure, and order. Belongingness and love needs come next and include needs for affectionate and intimate relationships with people in general and individuals. Esteem needs, next highest in the hierarchy, fall into two subcategories. First of these are the self-esteem needs, which include desires for achievement, for mastery and competence, and for independence and freedom. Second are the needs for the esteem of others, which include desires for prestige, reputation, and dominance. The self-actualization need, the last of the basic needs, is the desire to fulfill all of one's individual potentialities, "to become everything that one is capable of becoming." It alone of the basic needs can never be fully satisfied.

This hierarchy, Maslow emphasizes, does not constitute a rigidly fixed order. Only a relative satisfaction of a lower need is necessary for the emergence of a higher need, and as we move up the hierarchy, less satisfaction of lower needs is required for the activation of higher needs. Most normal members of our society, Maslow adds, are both partially satisfied and partially unsatisfied in all their basic needs at once, their higher needs being the least satisfied.

Maslow is less concerned, we should also note, with conscious motivation and behavior than with the fundamental needs that underlie both. Conscious desires and motivated behavior should

be considered only the symptoms or surface indicators of the basic needs. A single wish or act can serve several needs at once or different needs under different circumstances, and consequently we must be cautious in interpreting behavior.

Maslow's theory enjoys widespread acceptance; educators as well as management theorists commonly use it as a basic source. But although it appears intuitively true and offers a useful general account of motivation, available research fails to confirm it. In a recent review of the research, Wahba and Bridwell examined empirical studies that tested his theory in work situations and found little clear or consistent support for it. The two conclude that the research supports neither Maslow's classification of needs, his proposition that the deprivation of a need causes it to become dominant, nor his proposition that the gratification of a need eliminates it and activates the next higher need.

The two acknowledge, however, that the research does not invalidate the theory. Based largely on clinical work, the theory defies empirical testing. And further, the available research clearly suffers from conceptual, methodological, and measurement problems.

Maslow's theory has generated several reformulations among organizational theorists, the most notable of which, according to Wahba and Bridwell, is Alderfer's ERG theory. Alderfer (1969) collapses Maslow's hierarchy into the three need categories of existence needs (physiological needs and safety needs involving physical and material desires), relatedness needs (safety needs dependent on interpersonal relationships, belongingness and love needs, and needs for the esteem of others), and growth needs (self-esteem and self-actualization needs).

Wahba and Bridwell themselves offer a reformulation of Maslow's theory in response to the research evidence. They postulate a dual level hierarchy of maintenance needs (physiological and safety needs) and growth needs (the remainder of Maslow's need categories). Maslow himself, they note, speaks of a dual categorization of needs into deficiency and growth needs.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

The work of McGregor and Maslow finds support in the controversial Motivation-Hygiene theory of Herzberg, another central figure in the literature of work motivation. Herzberg (1964,

1968) advocates a two-factor theory of job attitudes by which job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not opposite ends of the same continuum, but separate and distinct and dependent on different sets of work conditions and worker needs. His theory is supported by numerous studies of a variety of work organizations.

According to Herzberg's theory, those work characteristics that bring job dissatisfaction, but contribute little to satisfaction, are the hygiene factors or dissatisfiers. These factors are extrinsic to the work content and concern the worker's relationship to the context of his or her job. They include matters of company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security. These factors affect people's pain-avoidance needs, their natural drive to avoid pain from their environment.

Those factors that produce job satisfaction and motivation—the motivators or satisfiers—are tied to the work content. They include achievement, recognition for achievement, intrinsic interest in the work itself, and growth or advancement. These factors serve people's needs for achievement and growth.

Herzberg's categories of work factors and needs, we should note, differ somewhat from those of McGregor. His division of work factors does not follow McGregor's separation of extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, for he includes two extrinsic rewards, recognition and advancement, among his motivators. Neither does his division of needs neatly match McGregor's Maslowian need hierarchy.

But the differences between the two are not serious. Recognition and advancement, as McGregor points out, serve higher-level ego needs, unlike the other extrinsic rewards. Both theorists pursue the same basic argument that we must consider two qualitatively different work and worker relationships, one dependent on lower-level needs, the other dependent on higher-level needs. The apparent disagreement stems from their use of different bases for classification. McGregor separates his two relationships according to the nature of the work characteristics; Herzberg according to the ends these characteristics serve.

As Herzberg continues, much in accord with McGregor, management has shortsightedly summed up human needs in solely hygienic terms. Hygienic factors demand attention, of course, for poor environmental conditions will cause job dissatisfaction. But management's attempts at increasing job satisfaction and produc-

tivity through improvements in hygiene alone cannot succeed.

Such attempts, Herzberg adds, foster a repeating cycle of hygienic improvements followed by worker demands for more. People's avoidance needs are multitudinous and never satisfied for long, and improved hygiene can only temporarily allay them. Workers will follow up hygienic improvements with new demands for increased salary, better working conditions, and the like.

The motivators, on the other hand, can provide genuine happiness and fulfillment at work because they meet positive rather than negative needs. They also function as motivators because the satisfaction they bring is achieved through the performance of the work itself. Workers in motivator-rich jobs can gain more satisfaction simply by working harder. While hygienic factors may serve to prevent dissatisfaction, the motivators "are necessary for improvement in performance beyond that pseudo-improvement which in substance amounts to coming up to a 'fair day's work'."

Management's failure to consider the intrinsic qualities of work, other than through the "pious espousal of cultural noises," Herzberg charges, has made "the history of work careers . . . a history of human waste." His solution, now widely seconded by organizational theorists, is job enrichment, or the expansion of work to provide the motivators of achievement, intrinsic interest, responsibility, recognition, and advancement. What is needed, he emphasizes, is not further rationalization of work to increase efficiency, but an enlargement of jobs so that workers can more fully use and develop their abilities.

Many educators accept Herzberg's work without question, but organizational theorists have responded with some skepticism. Many theorists question his two-factor concept of satisfaction in favor of the traditional view that satisfaction is unidimensional. Hackman and Oldham, for instance, argue that Herzberg's separation of job characteristics into motivators and hygienes may be largely the result of his research method and conclude that "the present conceptual status of the theory must be considered highly uncertain."

This criticism, however, need not set aside Herzberg's basic points about job context and job content. A brief look at an article by Thurman can help us, by way of illustration, in our evaluation of Herzberg's theory. Using several surveys of worker attitudes, Thurman concludes that the major sources of worker

dissatisfaction are lack of promotional prospects and restrictive job content that limits opportunities for personal development and provides little challenge. Other work characteristics, such as working conditions and pay, are of less importance to workers.

Thurman's conclusions at once contradict and support Herzberg. They contradict his two-factor concept by finding his motivators to be causes of dissatisfaction. But they also support him by finding his job content characteristics to be of greater concern to workers than job context matters. Thurman's discussion encourages us to accept Herzberg's basic contention: adequate hygiene serves as a precondition for satisfaction, but job content factors are the crucial determinants of worker satisfaction and effort.

The Incompatibility of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Rewards

The contributions of McGregor and Herzberg establish for us the primacy of work content and the dangers of management's traditional emphasis on job context and extrinsic controls. Recent research by Deci on intrinsic motivation shows that extrinsic rewards and punishments can be dangerous even when work provides intrinsic rewards.

Deci's work is particularly helpful as a response to the common assumption that extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are compatible and additive in their motivational effects. According to this view, management can best motivate workers by making as many rewards as possible—both extrinsic and intrinsic—contingent on effort.

Deci (1976) finds that extrinsic and intrinsic rewards are not always compatible. Extrinsic rewards can actually reduce intrinsic motivation, which he associates with basic needs to feel competent and self-determining. Extrinsic rewards, particularly such tangible rewards as contingent payments and the avoidance of punishment, subvert a person's sense of self-determination and intrinsic motivation as they make behavior dependent on external causes. The rewards shift the origin of motivation from within the person onto themselves; they, and not the person's own interest, become the reason for the behavior.

Such a shift of motivation changes the nature of a worker's participation at work: he or she finds the rewards more important

than the work itself and seeks ways to get them for the least effort. Much like McGregor, Deci argues that external rewards and controls create Theory X workers.

Not all extrinsic rewards, Deci adds, are dangerous. Praise and interpersonal support can enhance intrinsic motivation as they communicate that workers are competent and self-determining. The dangerous rewards are those that serve mainly to control behavior.

Deci's work, based on laboratory experiments rather than studies of actual work situations, is controversial, but it is gaining acceptance among organizational theorists, as Korman and others indicate. Among those supporting Deci is Meyer, whose criticism of merit pay programs complements Deci's work from the perspective of industrial experience and research.

Meyer accepts Deci's argument that contingent payments reduce intrinsic motivation and points out additional drawbacks to merit programs. Such programs, he states, are demeaning in that they emphasize workers' dependence on their supervisors. They also create competition among workers, which generates mutual hostility, distorts perceptions of self and others, and lessens interaction and communication. Most important, they threaten the self-esteem of the great majority of workers. Almost all workers believe themselves to be above-average performers; thus their expectations for substantial pay increases are bound to be frustrated by even well-administered merit programs. Workers will commonly react to the threat posed to their self-esteem by exerting pressure for lowered standards of performance, downgrading the value of the work, or disparaging their supervisors' capabilities.

Responding to the dangers of extrinsic rewards, Deci (1975) advises management to distinguish between the uses of rewards in keeping workers on the job and in motivating them. Clearly, adequate extrinsic rewards are necessary to attract workers and satisfy their basic needs. But management must avoid using contingent rewards to motivate and control workers and must instead rely on intrinsic rewards and growth needs to provide for positive satisfaction and motivation.

Deci sums up the directives of the human resources school into two major strategies for enhancing workers' intrinsic motivation. One is job enrichment, which is forcibly promoted by Herzberg. The other is participative management, by which workers participate in making decisions that affect them and thus exercise

greater control over their work. The two together provide stimulating and satisfying work as they unify worker and organization.

Like McGregor and Herzberg, Deci argues that management should structure work so that it releases rather than vitiates workers' positive motivation "to deal effectively and creatively with their environment." It should, in effect, structure work "so that people will motivate themselves."

THE WORK SITUATION OF TEACHERS

The human resources school provides us with a general view of work motivation. We now need to look at the peculiar work situation of public school teachers to see how we can apply this general view to it. A study by Sergiovanni offers a convenient starting point, since it applies the framework of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory to education.

Using an interview method developed by Herzberg, Sergiovanni (1967) studied the causes of work satisfaction and dissatisfaction among seventy-one elementary and secondary teachers from a variety of Monroe County, New York, districts. His results generally supported Herzberg's theory, though they included some surprises.

Achievement, recognition, and responsibility, he found, contributed the most to teachers' satisfaction and motivation. Teachers experienced achievement, their most powerful satisfier, as a feeling of having reached and affected students. This experience notably lacked concrete evidence of actual success. Teachers experienced recognition, their second most important satisfier, through a variety of forms, including letters, verbal statements, gifts, incentives, and committee appointments, from principals, supervisors, parents, students, and peers. Responsibility figured to be less powerful a satisfier than Sergiovanni expected. He speculated that the potentially great responsibility of teachers for their classroom work is circumscribed by the regulations and prescriptions of state, district, and school.

Two of Herzberg's motivators—advancement and intrinsic interest in the work itself—were conspicuously absent from Sergiovanni's list of satisfiers. The absence of advancement, he noted, is easily explained by teaching's lack of advancement opportunities. The teachers' response to the work itself was more surprising. Contrary to Herzberg's theory, teachers found the work itself to be a cause of both satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Sergiovanni explained that the work of a teacher, "potentially able to provide unlimited opportunity for creative and varied work," demands a great deal of maintenance and clerical activity and can consequently serve as a source of dissatisfaction.

Most important among the dissatisfiers, Sergiovanni found,

were problems in relations with students, relations with peers, supervision, and school policy and administration. Of these, poor relations with students exerted the greatest impact. Sergiovanni argued that happy relations with students, though central to teachers' experience of achievement and recognition, are not enough in themselves to create job satisfaction; poor relations, on the other hand, can cause considerable pain.

Lortie's sociological studies of teachers and the teaching profession (1969, 1975) allow us to confirm and develop Sergiovanni's conclusions. Based on the available literature and his own research, Lortie argues that the primary work rewards and motivators of teachers are intrinsic rewards tied to the act of teaching itself.

In contrast with the established professions, Lortie points out, teaching remains relatively "careerless" and barren of major extrinsic incentives, such as increases in money, prestige, and power. A salary schedule based on seniority and education, rather than performance, and a flat, unstaged career line preclude much meaningful variation in salary, prestige, or power. Teachers can do little, in either the short or long run, to increase the amount of extrinsic rewards they receive. The main opportunity for gains in extrinsic rewards lies in leaving teaching for administration.

The work rewards of most importance to teachers, Lortie continues, are intrinsic or psychic rewards, which "consist entirely of subjective valuations made in the course of work engagement." Of these subjective rewards, the dominant one is, as Sergiovanni found, a sense of having influenced students.

Lortie's own study of close to 6,000 Dade County, Florida, teachers indicates the importance these rewards hold for teachers' work satisfaction. Over three-quarters of the teachers, Lortie found, considered psychic rewards to be their major source of work satisfaction. Asked to choose among the psychic rewards, 86 percent of the teachers chose "knowing that I have 'reached' students and they have learned" as their primary psychic reward. The second most important psychic reward, chosen by 8 percent of the teachers, was the "chance to associate with the children or young people."

Unlike their extrinsic rewards, teachers' psychic rewards fluctuate according to effort and thus serve to direct teachers' work motivation. The pursuit and maximization of psychic rewards press teachers further into teaching, the source of these rewards.

We find that the service ethic of teachers and the structure of teaching rewards converge in the process of teaching.

This patterning of work and career rewards, Lortie explains, helps determine the dynamics of the school organization, as it shapes teachers' relationships with administrators and peers. What is crucial is that the rewards that count for teachers come from interaction with students in the classroom. Administrative and collegial constraints on teachers are limited. Teachers are thus most sensitive to students and remain "relatively independent of benefits controlled by administrators and peers." In their dealings with administration, teachers can assume a certain autonomy and "move away from subordination towards exchange," asserting their own claims on administration. Teachers grant administrators control over organizational matters, but assert their right to control instructional affairs.

Teachers' desire to maintain control over their classrooms is the natural desire of workers to control their work. This desire, however, takes on special import because of the nature of teachers' rewards. These rewards are subjective and self-defined and by their very nature must be determined by those who earn them. Teachers can best achieve them if they can monitor their own work and "select goals and means of assessment which are congruent with their personal priorities."

This press for autonomy assumes something of the form of an individualism and isolation of teachers. "Social and psychological boundaries," Lortie argues, "arise to augment the physical separation of teachers and classrooms." Teachers' norms allow them to turn to administrators or peers for support or advice, but they ward off any unsolicited interference. In their pursuit of individually defined rewards, teachers immerse themselves in their classrooms and remain relatively indifferent to extraclassroom affairs.

Teachers' psychic rewards, we must keep in mind, are fragile and achieved with great difficulty. As Lortie states, teaching is inherently problematic and plagued by endemic uncertainties that can create "diffuse anxiety and painful self-doubt." The goals of teaching are intangible and complex and never fully achieved; the assessment of learning necessarily remains difficult. Lacking clear evidence of student learning, many teachers are uncertain how successful they are, and "a high proportion experience recurrent doubts about the value of their work." Teachers engage their

personality, their very being, in a setting that acts to minimize their impact on students. They must teach an involuntary audience of immature students, balance the conflicting aims of befriending and controlling students, and work with groups rather than individuals. The problems are complicated by the isolation of teachers. Teachers must face their doubts alone, with little assistance or reassurance from their colleagues. "Teachers treasure the joys of accomplishment," Lortie concludes, "the more for their scarcity."

Teaching thus appears difficult and frustrating. It offers little return in extrinsic rewards and its intrinsic rewards are far from automatic. Lortie's analysis seems to vivify the commonplace that teaching is a "thankless task." As one teacher commented when interviewed, "It's very hard to be a teacher. You receive no money or respect. You must like kids." Teachers must draw from a deep desire to give and not ask much in return.

To appreciate fully the work problems of teaching, we must also look at some nationwide cultural trends that impinge on the schools and threaten teacher morale. One disrupting condition affecting teachers, Adams points out, is the present open conflict of values in American society. Teachers must carry on a value-charged task in the midst of conflicting and changing values, and many can unhappily find themselves in conflict with their community, students, administrators, or peers. This conflict can exact a payment of pervasive tension and alienation.

The problem of conflicting values, we must add, not only alienates individuals from their environment, but also challenges the institutions of education, which face the press of a divided and angry public. It seems that all the conflicts and contradictions of American society are being played out in education and that the schools have taken on the form of societal battlegrounds. As educational leadership falls into a confused and reactive stance, Leland Hall, president-elect of the Oregon Education Association, commented when interviewed, education seems left at the mercy of extremists.

The public demands of accountability, Adams continues, also create anxiety and frustration among teachers. The problem is not accountability itself, he writes, but the common form of accountability, which counters "prevailing professional practice and methods of teacher evaluation." This common form of accountability, essentially an attempt to impose a business-industrial

model of production on education, assumes that particular teacher actions "directly cause particular outcomes in student performance." It thus emphasizes measurable learning outcomes. Traditional practice, which acknowledges the uncertainty of the learning process, has "focused more on teacher and learner activities than on the learning outcomes of activities."

The demands of accountability not only question teachers' efforts and challenge their conceptions of teaching, but also interfere with their work. The extra documentation is frustrating in itself because it requires teachers to objectify or mechanize a fundamentally organic process. It also takes valuable time away from preparation and the business of teaching.

Accountability may also, Hills argues, create the opposite of what it intends and damage "the capacity of the school to fulfill its societal functions" by subverting teachers' participation in their work. Common approaches to accountability, emphasizing external controls and close supervision, will undermine the promising trend toward greater professionalization of teaching. As they diminish teacher autonomy and reduce teachers to the level of employees, they will promote "a trade union orientation among teachers" and subvert teachers' professional commitment and service motivation.

A further source of frustration for teachers, Adams writes, lies in the impossibility, given the conditions of mass education, of achieving "the ideal of the good shepherd ethic," the ideal of providing the best education for all students. This ethic, "promoted as student-centered teaching and individualized instruction," demands that teachers take responsibility for the individual development of each student. Such responsibility "asks for an almost endless investment of time and energy" and places the burden of failure on the teachers rather than the students. But in the present educational setting, teachers "cannot possibly do enough to meet the needs of every child," and their failure to meet the ideal can create "a constant sense of inadequacy."

Two additional conditions trouble schools and teachers. One phenomenon, declining enrollment conjoined with rising costs and declining revenues, is creating economic crises and forcing cutbacks in programs and reduction of staff. As Bert Simmons, principal of North Eugene High School, Eugene, Oregon, told the writer, the experience of declining enrollment can be like that of terminal cancer. To say the least, the dismissal of teachers disrupts

the supposedly secure environment of teaching and unnerves all teachers. It also poses the danger of teacher stagnation. It leaves a school without young teachers (the first to go) or the possibility of hiring new ones and thus stops the influx of new ideas.

Another phenomenon upsetting the working climate of schools is collective bargaining. What its long-term impact will be is not certain, but for the present it has politicized educational relations and intensified the differences between administrators and teachers. In some districts, collective bargaining disputes have polarized administrators and teachers into two warring camps and soured the morale of both. Mutual hostility and distrust have replaced collaborative efforts at solving problems, and individual and organizational goals have been split apart.

Conflicting values, accountability, an impossible ideal, declining enrollment, and collective bargaining all disrupt the educational climate and make teaching even more difficult today. In the face of such problems, many teachers, especially secondary teachers, Adams writes, are "weary and frustrated, some to the point of anger."

STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING THE MOTIVATION OF TEACHERS

Having examined the work environment of teachers, we now turn to what administrators can do to enhance the motivation of teachers. We will group numerous specific suggestions made in the literature and by practitioners into general guidelines, some adapted from a list of motivational strategies developed by Oldham. We will consider strategies that administrators can apply on a one-to-one basis as well as broad-reaching schemes that require organizational changes.

Some of these strategies can directly influence motivation, others only indirectly so. In the end, we must recognize that most aspects of school life shape teacher morale and motivation. Interviews with teachers and principals about the problems of motivation always broadened out into discussions of teaching, management, and education in general.

The following classification of strategies is somewhat arbitrary. It does not discuss all possible strategies, and it is forced to separate into distinct categories many aspects of administration that overlap. Some of the discussion also remains rather tentative because of the lack of confirming educational research. Moreover, this chapter reviews the various strategies as if they were uniformly applicable to all teachers, but as Sergiovanni and Elliott emphasize, administrators must always consider each teacher as an individual with individual needs.

James Huge (cited in "Motivating Teachers: Listen for a Change") argues that teachers' motivation is generated primarily on a one-to-one basis in encounters with administrators. The research on teachers' rewards questions this judgment, but there is no doubt that principals can do much to enhance their teachers' motivation on an individual basis. Huge offers several basic suggestions for principals that we can explore in greater depth. Principals can be most effective as motivators, he points out, if they set high expectations for accomplishment and reinforce teachers' efforts. They should also be good listeners, showing genuine concern, and share their own work goals with teachers, letting teachers know what is personally important and creating a sense of common endeavor.

Praising and Encouraging

We will begin with praise and encouragement, two complementary means for enhancing morale and motivation that are open to administrators. The importance of the two should be obvious, yet they warrant some discussion. Most of the teachers and principals interviewed felt a need to emphasize them as essential, and some teachers complained bitterly of poor school climates in which administrators showed only indifference or hostility toward teachers. In a profession marked by doubts and frustrations, teachers need and value praise, encouragement, and understanding, and such support clearly nurtures and reinforces their efforts.

If administrators are to encourage teachers, they must not only open themselves to their teachers, but also know them and their work. A simple means of acknowledging and praising teachers' efforts is the classroom visit. Braught offers guidelines for classroom visits that apply to praising in general. Principals who visit classes, he writes, should closely observe the classroom activities and, at the end of each visit, praise in specific terms achievements they have observed. The commonplaces of general praise will convey little information and have little impact. If principals notice any problems, Braught adds, they should avoid criticism and save the problems for future consideration and discussion.

Braught's treatment of praise, typical of many, raises two issues that need clarification. First is the problem of criticism. The common assumption that criticism and threats increase motivation appears mistaken. Oldham included "personally punishing" along with "personally rewarding" in his original list of motivational strategies, but he found that punishment proved counterproductive in practice when he tested his strategies in an actual business setting. Deci similarly finds that punishments decrease intrinsic motivation. Administrators still need to confront problems, of course, and we will shortly discuss a nonpunitive means of doing so.

Second is the problem of control. Behaviorist literature is full of detailed accounts of how praise or positive reinforcement should be applied for maximum effect on behavior. But praise will not retain its meaning and value if used as a tool of manipulation. When so used, it becomes merely a form of control and, as Deci argues, subverts people's sense of self-determination and

motivation.

The teachers and principals interviewed always coupled discussions of praise and support with demands for authenticity, variously phrased in terms of openness, honesty, and trust. One teacher, Ann Burr (Eastside Elementary School, Eugene, Oregon), typically desired principals to be both honest and understanding and, accordingly, able to confront problems without creating threats. Such principals, she stated, can let teachers know where they stand in an atmosphere of trust, so teachers need not fear that anything lies hidden. They can raise problems without blaming teachers, always leaving teachers a way to improve or solve the problems on their own initiative. Another teacher, Heloise Hanes (Malabon Elementary School, Eugene, Oregon), similarly asked that principals foster openness and a sense of security. They should be open to teachers' problems, she said, and able to listen, offer encouragement, and give practical help.

In essence, teachers want administrators to be supportive and authentic and, as Burr stated, build up teachers rather than tear them down. The guiding aim of principals, Schwartzrock noted, should be that of serving teachers through praising and encouraging their efforts and helping them solve their problems. What is needed is a Theory Y conception of people informed by genuine appreciation and concern.

Honoring

A more formal means of praising is honoring. Sergiovanni (1967) grouped the two together as recognition and found them the second most important source of teacher satisfaction and motivation. Although education is lacking in builtin means of honoring teachers, administrators can find ways to provide for some recognition. Elton Sorensen, principal of Kennedy Junior High School in Eugene, Oregon, commented in an interview that he seeks to provide recognition by crediting teachers for their ideas and work in school publications and in his correspondence with the district. Simmons stated that he honors and motivates his teachers by bringing outsiders into the school to view its programs and by appointing teachers to special projects and task forces for the study of new programs, for program development, and for the dissemination of school programs to other schools.

Miller and Swick offer additional practical suggestions.

Administrators can recognize and reward teachers' efforts, they write, by means of announcements at faculty meetings, briefings at workshops, awards for outstanding teaching, appointments to school committees, and paid memberships in professional organizations. They can also enable teachers to attend conferences and fund teachers' ideas for special projects with minigrants. Miller and Swick also emphasize the value of community recognition for teachers, which can be achieved through the use of the local media and school-community meetings.

Such forms of honoring can unfortunately degenerate into meaningless plaques and empty gestures. As Robert Mattson, professor of education at the University of Oregon, emphasized when interviewed, administrators must base their response on a true recognition of the responsibilities and value of teachers' work. Again, authenticity is a must.

Setting Goals

Some motivational strategies are not directly connected to rewards, but instead serve to guide and enhance their pursuit. Among them is goal setting, which, as Oldham argues, heightens motivation by providing a direction for task accomplishment. Oldham's claim is supported by Latham and Yukl's review of organizational research. The two find that goal-setting programs have proved effective in improving performance in a variety of organizational settings and at both managerial and nonmanagerial levels. They also conclude that specific goals are superior to general goals and that difficult, but attainable, goals are superior to easy goals.

The push for the rationalization of education has brought goal setting into prominence as a means for improving both staff management and instructional planning. But as our discussion of accountablility shows, this push seems misguided and fundamentally inimical to the process of education. The findings of Latham and Yukl corroborate such a judgment. Goal-setting programs appear to have limited value, they conclude, where jobs are complex and performance difficult to measure precisely.

Most of the practitioners interviewed were ambivalent about the use of formal goal setting as part of teacher supervision. As a group, they agreed that the process holds some motivational value, but also felt that it has a potential for abuse if taken too

seriously. One principal, Barbara Keirnes (Edgewood Elementary School, Eugene, Oregon), warned that goal setting can be overused and limit the flexibility and spontaneity of teachers. Schwartzrock questioned the use of goal setting for teacher evaluation. The goals teachers set for their work might not truly reflect the quality of their teaching, he stated, and an emphasis on specific goals might encourage teachers to neglect other important aims. Hanes added that the value of goal setting depends on the ability of the principal to draw out useful goals from their teachers.

We need not doubt, however, the benefit of setting high expectations for achievement. As Huge argues, such high expectations, when reinforced, can be self-fulfilling. They act to pull forth teachers' best efforts so that they can, in fact, achieve them.

In a journal article Huge carries this concern with goals further to a conception of principals as "staff development leaders," who work systematically to encourage teachers' efforts at growth. Principals should not only aid teachers in setting their work goals, he argues, but also share their own goals and progress toward them with their staff and continuously articulate the school's goals for their staff. By acting as models for growth, principals generally influence the working climate of their schools.

Although the value of formal goal setting for education remains in question, it is helpful to review two goal-setting programs to see how they operate. One method, Kampmeier's "Strategy for Creative Leadership," which borrows heavily from McGregor and Carl Rogers as well as behaviorist thought, focuses on a teacher's personal goals. In a structured interview, a teacher works out with his or her principal mutually satisfactory personal goals, goals in which the teacher's and school's interests meet, and a specific plan for their achievement. Essential to the success of the process is the development of a quality relationship, which should be based on authenticity, empathy, and unconditional regard for the teacher as a person.

Kampmeier's process opens with one long interview of about three hours. The initial interview proceeds through the following stages: (1) establishing rapport based on conversation, without interrogation, about the teacher's interests and concerns; (2) defining and clarifying the teacher's specific goals; (3) determining specific rewards and benefits attached to the goals to provide for motivation; (4) determining specific steps to be taken to remove

obstacles in the way and achieve the goals; and (5) establishing deadlines for completing each of the steps. Weekly followup interviews allow the principal and teacher to maintain commitment to the goals and work on any problems that occur along the way. Kampmeier acknowledges that this process demands considerable time from the principal and suggests that principals begin with just one teacher.

A second and simpler scheme, reported by Nielsen, centers on teachers' instructional planning. Under Nielsen's plan, teachers are made responsible for setting their own classroom goals and measurable objectives, purchasing materials and supplies for their classes, and reporting their achievement of the goals. The teachers' goals must be confirmed by the principal, and their achievement forms the basis for teacher evaluation. Nielsen argues that such a plan enables teachers to be both "free and responsible," "autonomous as well as accountable."

When Nielsen, an elementary school principal, initiated her plan with her own teachers, many inexperienced in goal setting, she divided the school year into three planning periods. In the fall, the teachers attended work sessions on goal writing; they wrote goals (two goals with two-to-four objectives for each major subject area) to cover six weeks of their classes. The principal and the teachers then conferred to reach agreement on workable goals. Later, with greater expertise, the teachers wrote two more sets of goals to cover longer periods of instruction. The principal held planning and followup conferences at the beginning and end of each planning period.

Providing Feedback

Attention to goal setting naturally leads to a concern with its complement, the assessment of goal accomplishment. Oldham argues that informing workers of their performance can increase their motivation and that supervisors should devise means to provide workers with as much feedback as possible. Deci would have us qualify this judgment by adding that negative feedback, like criticism, decreases intrinsic motivation.

Assessment presents a special problem for teachers, since it is so problematic and so intimately tied to their psychic rewards. As Lortie emphasizes, the complexities and uncertainties of goals and assessment leave teachers in chronic, and sometimes serious, doubt

of their effectiveness. The behavioral approaches to education seem to offer teachers a remedy, since they promise clarity and precision in assessment. But again, as we noted about goal-setting schemes, the promise is a false one built on assumptions more suited to the mechanics of factory production than to the vitality of teaching and learning.

Appraisal may best serve as a motivator and catalyst for change, Pedersen continues, if it is diagnostic rather than judgmental and thus preserves the professional respect between teacher and supervisor. Huge adds that the threat inherent in appraisal can be minimized if it is clearly separated from dismissal procedures.

Similarly, Keirnes emphasized the principal's use of the supervision cycle to provide diagnostic feedback. She advocated that principals carefully observe teachers at work and record accurate data on their achievement of their classroom goals. Principals can then present, without judgment, the collected data to the teachers to enable them to evaluate themselves. The dominant tone of the process should be that of a collaborative effort. Keirnes also favored greater use of collegial evaluation to complement principal-teacher supervision.

Stimulating Teachers

Several practitioners stressed the importance of new ideas for teacher motivation. The long-term practice of teaching threatens to turn teachers' personal engagement in their work into the staleness of routine; new ideas clearly can provide recurrent stimulation and freshness and add spirit to teaching.

The most obvious means of stimulating teachers with new ideas lies in staff development, which we will discuss shortly. For the present, we can mention some practices and approaches more directly tied to the principal's role. First of all, as Schwartzrock stated, principals should seek to create an atmosphere that draws forth rather than suppresses new ideas and practices. Schwartzrock encourages new ideas by allowing his teachers to experiment without fear of reprisals if they fail. Sorenson said that he listens intently to all new proposals and avoids dismissing any. If an idea seems poor, he continued, he tries to ask the right questions so that teachers will realize on their own the problems involved.

Principals also need to find ways directly to stimulate thinking

and provide new ideas. To this end, Sorenson arranges for intensive one-to-one discussions with his staff on work-related topics, which he researches thoroughly beforehand. Such interviews, he believes, encourage teachers to question and understand better their beliefs and practices. Simmons sends teachers out of the building, to workshops, conferences, and other schools for new ideas. He emphasized the principal's responsibility to search out opportunities for teachers to become involved and excited in something new. Acting on this concern, he recently involved his school in a new reading program—sponsored by a research and development institution—that uses all teachers for reading instruction. He applied for his school, sent out teachers to examine an exemplary school program, and then set his staff to work on implementation. Some practitioners noted the value of teacher exchanges, which bring new ideas not only to the teachers involved, but also to whole schools. Keirnes also emphasized the stimulation that can come from greater peer interaction.

Minigrant programs also need mention. Such programs reward as well as encourage new ideas by funding teacher-initiated projects supplementing regular classroom activities. As McGrady points out, they vary in scope and funding, but small ones can still be effective. One program he describes uses a budget of $2,000 and awards grants ranging in amounts from $75 to $250. Their benefits, he suggests, can be great: they enable districts to respond quickly to new ideas, encourage teachers' creativity, and reward teachers with a chance to realize their classroom ambitions in practice.

Improving Teachers' Professional and Personal Effectiveness

Although traditionally staff development "rarely rises above a superficial level," as Lortie complains, seriously pursued inservice programs can well serve teacher satisfaction and motivation. In addition to stimulating teachers with new ideas, they provide a direct, formal means of helping teachers both teach more effectively and manage with less strain the inherent frustrations of the profession.

Mary Frances Callan, organization-staff development specialist for the Eugene Public Schools, stressed the value of a dual approach to staff development. For Callan, programs should

address both professional skills (including subject matter and generalist teaching skills) and personal skills (including general coping and interpersonal skills).

The value of sound professional staff development should be self-evident: it is the most systematic way to improve teachers' classroom performance and increase their primary work rewards and motivation. Adams recommends inservice as a means of alleviating teacher frustration. By giving teachers usable skills and not merely "quick inspiration," it can enable them "to transform the status quo" and achieve more nearly the ideal. Lortie, concerned with the vitiating uncertainties of instruction, calls for special inservice attention to goal setting and assessment.

Personal staff development warrants more concern than it has traditionally received. The work culture of the schools, as Lortie discusses, has failed to come to terms with the destructive tensions of teaching or to provide means to cope with them, and teachers are left alone to fight their frustrations and anger as best they can. Levenkron, a school guidance counselor, advocates the use of group and individual counseling for anxious and alienated teachers, who normally keep their problems hidden for fear of being considered incompetent. Adams favors including values clarification in inservice programs as a response to the problem of conflicting values. Values clarification provides experience in identifying personal values, considering their determinants, and examining their effects. Hall, distressed at adversarial relations between admnistrators and teachers, pointed to the need for inservice activities that can help the two work together in collaboration.

Also deserving consideration is the potential value of organizational development, which offers an extension of personal staff development to the school as an organic system. Both a field of study and an active practice, organizational development provides a theory of how organizations work and strategies for organizational change. It views organizations as interdependent systems of people rather than collections of individuals, as Richard Schmuck and his colleagues discuss, and it accordingly recognizes that many organizational problems arise from the nature of the organization itself rather than the limitations of individuals. In practice, it seeks to restructure organizations, creating new system norms and interpersonal skills, so that they achieve a systematic, but still flexible, means for ongoing problem-solving.

The Eugene Public Schools, Oregon, maintain a cadre of organizational development specialists ready to assist schools in diagnosing and resolving organizational problems. In one simple intervention described by Burr, the cadre came to the aid of a school suffering from staff distrust of its principal. Providing outside mediation, it was able to guide the staff and principal as they met as a group to bring the underlying problems out into the open.

Increasing Teachers' Control over Their Work

In accord with human resources theory, most educators emphasize the motivational value of sharing administrative power and responsibility with staff. The practitioners interviewed favored this sharing in its various forms and under various names, including participative management, collaborative decision-making, staff involvement in program development, and the delegation of responsibility to individuals. This power sharing, they judged, not only leads to better management and programs, as it makes use of the full talents of the school, but also promotes greater staff understanding and ownership of programs and therefore greater staff commitment to those programs.

Some power-sharing programs too readily accept the hierarchical structure of schools and the division of power between supervisor and worker. The sharing remains a gift from above and as such is paternalistic. Aware of this problem, one elementary school principal interviewed by the writer tries to avoid it by conceiving of the principal's role in terms of mutual collaboration rather than executive power. According to Schwartzrock, the principal serves not as a boss, but as a helper whose task is aiding teachers attend most fruitfully to their work, the crucial work of the school. Schwartzrock accordingly advocated sharing responsibility with teachers as fully as possible.

As an ideal, teachers should enjoy as much control as possible over their work, both over their classroom practice and over school policy. This control is desirable both for its motivational effects and for its equity. It should encourage intrinsic motivation, according to Deci, as it increases self-determination. It should also help achieve McGregor's ideal of integrating individual and organizational goals.

The lack of power and self-determination remains a serious

problem for workers in general. It may be, as Nord suggests, a more potent cause of worker alienation than is uninteresting work. Teachers enjoy more power than most workers, but powerlessness still afflicts teachers. Nielsen studied the conditions affecting teacher effectiveness in open space schools and found power to be a crucial factor. Conditions limiting teacher effectiveness, she reports, were teachers' feeling of powerlessness, lack of personal security, and perception that principal-teacher communication was unilateral. Conditions encouraging productive and cooperative work were, conversely, teachers' ability to make autonomous decisions, feeling of security, and perception that communication was mutual.

Adams pointedly sums up the problem: "Among professionals, dictation breeds dissatisfaction; dissatisfaction breeds and increases the weight of every other burden of professional practice."

Attempts to relieve the problem of powerlessness need to be genuine. Herzberg dismisses as seductive and false common forms of participative management that provide only the feeling of self-determination and not the real thing. One teacher interviewed complained angrily of the hypocritical use of staff involvement in which participation is eagerly welcomed and then ignored. Administrators need to forego "window dressing," the teacher stressed, and be honest in their sharing of power and decision-making.

An ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management review of organizational research, *Managerial Control: A Middle Way*, helps to clarify the issues of sharing power. Management theory has traditionally assumed that organizational power is finite and that the sharing of power necessarily reduces administrative control. But much research, this review argues, challenges these assumptions; its evidence shows that organizational power is mutual and not fixed and that the powers held by supervisors and workers rise and fall in unison. Far from decreasing administrative control, the delegation of power increases the power of administrators as it increases the power of workers.

The wise principal, the review concludes, should not fear sharing power, for his or her influence will grow as the influence of the staff grows. An autocratic principal who jealously grasps power actually stunts it, and the principal who sows it breeds greater influence for all.

Practical attempts at sharing power often run into the problem of teacher disinterest, despite their potential benefits. Teachers tend to concentrate their efforts, as Lortie points out, on the core tasks of teaching and turn away from organizational issues. Stan Turner, a teacher at South Eugene High School in Eugene, Oregon, similarly stated when interviewed that burdened teachers, while desirous of greater say, are also very jealous of their time. Several teachers and principals noted that teachers have not always followed through in participative decision-making programs when given the opportunity.

In response to this problem, another ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management review, *Participative Decision-Making*, suggests that participative decision-making programs be voluntary and selective. An ideal program would offer participation to those teachers who desire it and not force it on others. Program designers should also offer participation in those areas of greatest concern to teachers. By providing a variety of options for teacher involvement, a decision-making program could present teachers the chance to influence the policies that affect them without demanding they join in other matters. A school could offer teachers several options for involvement through a decentralized program that assigns decision-making responsibility to different groups for such areas as curriculum planning, classroom management, instructional program arrangement, general school organization, and building construction.

Huge suggests another means of giving teachers variable opportunities for participation in decision-making. Administrators should describe in advance upcoming decision-making issues, he states in "Motivating Teachers: Listen for a Change," and ask teachers to indicate in writing how much they wish to be involved. Administrators can then invite interested teachers to join in the decision-making or proceed on their own if teachers show little interest. As well as giving advance notice, he adds, administrators should well publicize decision-making meetings so that teachers who change their minds can still participate.

Keirnes offers still another workable approach that integrates selective involvement in decision-making with planning teams at the elementary level. Under her two-stage approach to school management, the teaching staff is divided into planning teams of up to five or six teachers each according to grade level. Each team

elects a team leader who sits with the principal on a school leadership group, which decides who will make what decisions. The leadership team normally reserves for itself administrative matters of little staff interest and refers back to the planning teams issues of more vital interest. The planning teams decide all curriculum matters. At the secondary level, a similar scheme could employ subject-area instead of grade-level planning teams. For Keirnes, such an approach to sharing school control presents the major means of nurturing teacher motivation.

Promoting Collaborative Relations

Although the sense of powerlessness clearly troubles teachers as well as other workers, a recent study by Forsyth and Hoy indicates that it may be less troublesome for educators than collegial isolation. The two researchers examined the relationship between isolation and the feeling of alienation for educators at all levels from the elementary school to the graduate school. They found to their surprise that interaction with colleagues was more important for educators' work satisfaction, which they defined as the experience of intrinsic pride and meaning in work, than was interaction with the power networks of the school.

Collegial interaction, the authors argue, is crucial for two basic reasons. It provides emotional support and security and it stimulates new ideas through the meeting of different viewpoints. Greater interaction among teachers thus helps to remedy the anxieties and frustrations of a lonely profession and promotes more creative work. It is also valuable for its encouragement of a sense of community and its furtherance of the unity of individual and organization. For Mattson, the easing of isolation and development of community is a powerful, but largely ignored, means of satisfying and motivating teachers.

For Lortie, greater collaboration among teachers also seems essential for the healthy development of the teaching profession. More effective collegial relationships, he argues at length, can help offset the traditional individualism, conservatism, and presentism of the teaching ethos, which threaten to handicap the profession's response to the current pressures for educational change.

Schools can promote teacher interaction and collaboration through a variety of forms, but two basic approaches seem the most promising, both for their motivational potential and for their

impact on the profession. One is greater collegial participation in management. The other is greater collaboration in instruction.

Work teams have received considerable support from management literature for their effect on worker satisfaction and motivation. But the benefits of team teaching, education's counterpart, are less clear. Some indications that team teaching arrangements improve satisfaction and motivation are questioned by the recent Management Implications of Team Teaching project conducted by the Center for Educational Policy and Management at the University of Oregon. This study, as Charters reports, found no relationship between teaming arrangements and work and career satisfaction. Bredo finds that the costs of formal collaboration among teachers tend to be high and the rewards few because of the nature and demands of teaching. Such problems as the likelihood of disagreement among teachers, the threat posed by peer evaluation, and the complex demands of organizing team efforts, he argues, work to limit teachers' task interdependence and keep teams small and voluntaristic.

There are, of course, many means short of formal team teaching that can provide greater collaboration in instruction. Among them is the use of planning teams for ongoing curriculum planning. Keirnes values such teams as highly for their collegial interaction as for their furtherance of teacher control over school affairs. Lortie also suggests such means as trading of classes, group staffing of individual students, and observation of the teaching of peers.

Differentiating Extrinsic Rewards

The reward structure for teachers is a flat one without meaningful variation in money, status, or power. Although this structure serves to heighten the intrinsic rewards of teaching, many educators complain of its motivational limitations. Some educators have responded with schemes for motivating teachers with extrinsic rewards. We will look at two general approaches that incorporate the traditional incentives of merit pay and advancement into the teaching profession.

For Bruno and Nottingham, merit pay seems the best means for improving the performance of teachers. The two propose a complicated incentive scheme to reward teachers with some precision according to student performance. Under their plan,

applied by the Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District, California, collegial teams bear responsibility as groups for their students' achievement, and they receive incentive pay for students' achievement and receive incentive pay for achievement beyond predetermined goals. The achievement goals accommodate students' needs. This plan, the authors argue, will promote greater collegial responsibility as well as motivate and reward teachers.

Another plan is used by School District No. 66 of Omaha, Nebraska. According to Jim Tangedahl, principal of Westside Senior High School, the district's pay schedule combines elements of differentiated staffing and merit plans, since it adjusts pay ranges in accord with responsibility and performance. The district's contract establishes both minimum salary levels and merit pay above the guaranteed minimum levels. This compromise plan, Tangedahl explained, balances the teachers' desire for a standard pay schedule and the board's commitment to performance-based pay. The evaluation process enjoys the support of both administrative staff and local education association members.

Although merit schemes may work satisfactorily for individual districts, they seem ill-advised in general for various reasons. The most common objection is that they are difficult to administer because teacher evaluation is so problematic. Neither achievement-based nor observation-based evaluation, Pedersen argues, can provide certainty. A second objection is that merit plans thwart teachers' desires for equality of rewards. Such equality not only nurtures an egalitarian spirit, but also protects teachers' autonomy, as it limits administrative controls.

The conclusions of Meyer and Deci further condemn merit plans. Such plans embody a basic condescension, promote unhealthy competition, threaten self-esteem, and weaken intrinsic motivation. Financial incentives carry the potential to cheapen education and subvert teachers' service ethic.

Nevertheless, proposals to stage teachers' careers and provide for advancement warrant more attention. Meyer advocates a promotional system as a substitute for merit plans, and most management theorists find advancement to be a much more potent motivator than money. Lortie in particular pleads the value of a career ladder for teachers. The present lack of career stages, he contends, "subtly depreciates the status of classroom teaching" and encourages teachers to give only a limited commitment to teaching as a career. "It is not enough to be 'merely' a teacher": one must be

on the way to administrative rank or find fulfillment in one's family. Older teachers are stigmatized and relationships between younger and older teachers weakened. The solidarity of the profession is thus stunted.

One career staging proposal that Lortie singles out for mention is that of Benson. According to Benson's four-level career schedule, new teachers start as apprentices or aides under close supervision. After completing their apprenticeship, they become regular teachers and take on the traditional responsibilities of classroom teaching. Two further specialist levels are open to experienced teachers. A first-level specialist assumes the duties of teaching advanced materials, using newly developed teaching methods, holding demonstration teaching sessions, and engaging in applied educational research. A second-level specialist assumes the additional responsibility for training apprentice teachers.

Lortie hopes that some such proposal could satisfy the wishes of both administrators and teachers. But like merit plans, career ladder schemes face a strong and traditional opposition from teachers because they challenge teachers' equality of rewards. They also raise another hindrance: plans to differentiate teaching roles, as Templeton discusses, necessarily demand a serious renovation of the school organization.

Enriching Teachers' Work

Along with participative management, job enrichment looms large in human resources thought, and some educators now call for the enrichment of teachers' work. Teaching hardly needs enrichment according to the standards of most organizational theorists, but we can still apply enrichment as a general frame of mind and strategy for motivating teachers.

Sergiovanni and Elliott offer us such a general application. Influenced by Herzberg and Maslow, they ask schools to build more opportunities for growth into teaching so that it can most fully nurture personal and professional growth, as well as work effort and satisfaction. The task, they continue, is one of cultivating Herzberg's motivators. Administrators should provide an atmosphere of support and approval, involve teachers in school management—in setting goals, planning programs, and solving problems—delegate responsibility, further teachers' autonomy, provide teachers all the information they need, and in general

arrange the work of the school to make full use of teachers' desires for growth. Many of the practitioners interviewed by the writer seconded these suggestions. Enrichment sums up much of what we have proposed.

CONCLUSION

Although many issues of teacher motivation remain unresolved, some things are clear. The answer to teacher motivation lies in intrinsic motivation. And intrinsic motivation belongs to self-determining and effective teachers. It does not come from money and controls.

We have revealed some of the contradictions of common approaches to motivation that are marked by deceit and manipulation and worked out an alternative approach that favors a union of effort and fulfillment, of organizational and worker needs. Human resources theory and research support this view in both value and fact. Whereas controls and coercion, human resources theorists argue, act only to alienate workers and stunt their effort, work that is fulfilling and done in a supportive environment draws out workers' natural drive for creative and dedicated work.

The profession of teaching in many ways approaches the ideal of work. Its natural potential for motivation, however, is inhibited by teaching's anxieties and often fragile rewards. Educators who have sought to improve motivation and productivity through the further rationalization of education have borrowed the worst from business and industry. Their approach is backward: it can only make teaching more like the work the human resources theorists condemn. Educators should instead seek to release teachers' intrinsic motivation. To this end, schools should try to ease the frustrations of teaching and encourage teachers' effectiveness and achievement of psychic rewards.

More specifically, administrators should help teachers develop their classroom skills, set learning goals, and assess achievement; provide for praise, support, recognition, and stimulation; promote collaborative relations; and further teachers' control of their work. All these strategies must draw from an acceptance of teachers as partners in a collective pursuit, and all of them together should serve to enrich teachers' work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Many of the items in this bibliography are indexed in ERIC's monthly catalogs *Resources in Education (RIE)* and *Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE)*. Reports in *RIE* are indicated by an "ED" number; journal articles in *CIJE* are indicated by an "EJ" number.

ED numbers. Availability is noted, from the publisher or from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. To order from EDRS, specify the ED number, type of reproduction desired—microfiche (MF) or paper copy (HC), and number of copies. Add postage, figured at the following rates, to the cost of all orders and include check or money order payable to EDRS.

1st class: (MF only) 1-3, $0.15; 4-7, $0.28.

4th class: 75 or fewer MF or HC pages, $0.48; each additional 75 MF or HC pages through 525, $0.18; 526 or more MF or HC pages, $0.11 per each additional 75 pages.

UPS: 75 or fewer MF or HC pages, not to exceed $1.04 each additional 75 MF or HC pages through 525, $0.30; 526 or more MF or HC pages, $3.13 to $15.64 per each additional 75 pages.

EJ numbers. Availability is noted, from the publisher or from University Microfilms International (UMI), 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. To order from UMI, place orders through toll-free hotline (800) 521-0600 or prepay by cash, check, money order, or credit card. Specify quantity, EJ number, journal title, article title, and volume, issue, and date.

Adams, David W. "Tired and Frustrated Teachers." *Today's Education*, 64, 1 (January-February 1975), pp. 37, 40-41. EJ 131 664. UMI $6.00.

Alderfer, Clayton P. "An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 2 (May 1969), pp. 142-75. Journal Dept., Academic Press, Inc., 111 Fifth Ave., New York, NY 10003.

Alderfer, Clayton P. "A Critique of Salancik and Pfeffer's Examination of Need-Satisfaction Theories." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 4 (December 1977), pp. 658-69. EJ 171 551. UMI $4.00.

Argyris, Chris. "Personality and Organization Theory Revisited." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18, 2 (June 1973), pp. 141-67. EJ 077 237. UMI $6.00.

Benson, Charles S. *The Economics of Public Education*. 2d ed. New York:

Houghton Mifflin, 1968. 3rd edition, $17.75. Houghton Mifflin Company, Wayside Road, Burlington, MA 01803.

Bowers, C.A. "Emergent Ideological Characteristics of Educational Policy." *Teachers College Record*, 79, 1 (September 1977), pp. 33-54. EJ 170 713. UMI $4.00.

Braught, Loran. "The Elementary Principal's Role in Improving Reading Instruction." *Contemporary Education*, 48, 3 (Spring 1977), pp. 158-60. EJ 166 731. UMI $4.00.

Bredo, Eric. "Collaborative Relations among Elementary School Teachers." *Sociology of Education*, 50, 4 (October 1977), pp. 300-309. EJ 170 613. UMI $4.00.

Bruno, James E. "Response to Sergiovanni." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 11, 2 (Spring 1975), pp. 118-20. UMI $6.00.

Bruno, James E., and Nottingham, Marvin A. "Linking Financial Incentives to Teacher Accountability in School Districts." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 10, 3 (Autumn 1974), pp. 46-62. EJ 107 287. UMI $6.00.

Charters, W.W., Jr. "The Effects of the Team Organization of Elementary Schools on Teacher Influence and Work Attitudes: A Replication." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Toronto, March 1978. 41 pages. ED 152 758 MF $0.83 HC $2.06.

Cohen, Elizabeth G. "Open Space Schools: The Opportunity to Become Ambitious." *Sociology of Education*, 46, 2 (Spring 1973), pp. 143-61. EJ 075 131. UMI $6.00.

Coverdale, G.M. "Some Determinants of Teacher Morale in Australia." *Educational Research*, 16, 1 (November 1973), pp. 34-39. EJ 100 354. Contact publisher, King, Thorne, and Stace, Ltd., School Rd., Hove BN 34 JE, Sussex, England.

Cummings, T.G.; Molloy, Edmond S.; and Glen, Roy H. "Intervention Strategies for Improving Productivity and the Quality of Work Life." *Organizational Dynamics*, 4, 1 (Summer 1975), pp. 52-68. AMACOM, American Management Associations, 135 West 50th St., New York, NY 10020. $6.75.

Deci, Edward L. *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum Press, 1975. Plenum Publishing Corporation, 227 West 17th St., New York, NY 10011. $14.95.

Deci, Edward L. "The Hidden Costs of Rewards." *Organizational Dynamics*, 4, 3 (Winter 1976), pp. 61-72. 12 pages. ED number not yet assigned. For ordering information, see Cummings above. $6.75.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. *Participative Decision-Making*. Research Action Brief. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1977.

4 pages. ED 143 062. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403. Free.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. *Managerial Control: A Middle Way*. Research Action Brief. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1978. 4 pages. ED 155 775. For ordering information, see ERIC Clearinghouse above.

Forsyth, Patrick B., and Hoy, Wayne K. "Isolation and Alienation in Educational Organizations." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 14, 1 (Winter 1978), pp. 80-96. EJ 183 281. UMI $4.00.

Gardner, Leonard. "Humanistic Education and Behavioral Objectives: Opposing Theories of Educational Science." *School Review*, 85, 3 (May 1977), pp. 376-94. EJ 163 660. UMI $4.00.

Gregorc, Anthony F., and Hendrix, David F. "Are Turned-Off Teachers Turning off Your Schools?" *School Management*, 17, 3 (March 1973), pp. 8, 33. EJ 072 496. Journal no longer published.

Hackman, J. Richard, and Oldham, Greg R. "Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 2 (August 1976), pp. 250-79. For ordering information, see Alderfer (1969) above.

Herzberg, Frederick. "The Motivation-Hygiene Concept and Problems of Manpower." *Personnel Administration*, 27, 1 (January-February 1964), pp. 3-7.

Herzberg, Frederick. "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?" *Harvard Business Review*, 46, 1 (January-February 1968), pp. 53-62. Subscription Service Dept., P.O. Box 9730, Greenwich, CT 06835.

Hills, Jean. "On Accountability in Education." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 10, 1 (Winter 1974), pp. 1-17. EJ 092 743. UMI $6.00.

Huge, James. "The Principal as Staff Development Leader." *Educational Leadership*, 34, 5 (February 1977), pp. 384-86. EJ 155 100. UMI $4.00.

Kalleberg, Arne L. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review*, 42, 1 (February 1977), pp. 124-43. EJ 157 869. UMI $4.00.

Kampmeier, Curt. "Creative Leadership in the School." *Theory into Practice*, 15, 5 (December 1976), pp. 360-67. EJ 159 649. UMI $4.00.

Korman, Abraham K.; Greenhaus, Jeffrey H.; and Badin, Irwin J. "Personnel Attitudes and Motivation." In *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 28, 1977, edited by Mark R. Rosenzweig and Lyman W. Porter, pp. 175-96. Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews, 1977. Annual Reviews, Inc., 4139 El Camino Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306. $1.00.

Latham, Gary P., and Yukl, Gary A. "A Review of Research on the

Application of Goal Setting in Organizations." *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 4 (December 1975), pp. 824-45. 22 pages. ED number not yet assigned. Business Manager, Dr. Dennis F. Ray, P.O. Drawer K2, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS 39762. $6.00.

Levenkron, Steven. "Why Teachers Can't Teach." *NASSP Bulletin*, 57, 377 (December 1973), pp. 47-55. EJ 090 444. UMI $6.00.

Lortie, Dan C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." In *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers*, edited by Amitai Etzioni, pp. 1-53. New York: The Free Press, 1969. The Free Press, 866 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022. Code No. 90960. $11.95.

Lortie, Dan C. *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975. University of Chicago Press, ATTN: Order Dept., 111030 South Langley, Chicago, IL 60628. $4.95, paper. $9.95, cloth.

Marjoribanks, Kevin. "Bureaucratic Orientations, Autonomy and the Professional Attitudes of Teachers." *Journal of Educational Administration*, 15, 1 (May 1977), pp. 104-13. EJ 165 867. UMI $4.00.

Maslow, Abraham H. *Motivation and Personality*. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1970. Harper and Row, Inc., Ten East 53rd St., New York, NY 10022. $13.95.

McGrady, Seamus. "Manaaging Minigrants." *Nation's Schools*, 93, 2 (February 1974), pp. 39-42, 88. EJ 091 266. Journal no longer published.

McGregor, Douglas. *The Professional Manager*. Edited by Caroline McGregor and Warren G. Bennis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967. McGraw-Hill, Princeton Rd., Hightstown, NJ 08520. $14.95.

Meyer, Herbert H. "The Pay-for-Performance Dilemma." *Organizational Dynamics*, 3, 3 (Winter 1975), pp. 39-50. 12 pages. ED number not yet assigned. For ordering information, see Cummings above. $6.75.

Miller, Harry G., and Swick, Kevin J. "Community Incentives for Teacher Excellence." *Education*, 96, 3 (Spring 1976), pp. 235-37. EJ 149 308. UMI $4.00.

"Motivating Teachers: Listen for a Change." *Education U.S.A.*, 20, 24 (February 13, 1978), p. 180. National School Public Relations Association, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209. Free.

Nielsen, V[illegible]elmine R. "Helping Teachers Change." *Childhood Education*, 49, 3 (December 1972), pp. 134-37. EJ 065 897. UMI $6.00.

Nord, Walter R. "The Failure of Current Applied Behavioral Science: A Marxian Perspective." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 10, 4 (October-November-December 1974), pp. 557-78. NTL

Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, P.O. Box 9155, Rosslyn Station, Arlington, VA 22209. $3.75, prepaid.

Nottingham, Marvin A. "Response to Sergiovanni." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 11, 2 (Spring 1975), pp. 116-17. UMI $6.00.

Oldham, Greg R. "The Motivational Strategies Used by Supervisors: Relationships to Effectiveness Indicators." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 1 (February 1976), pp. 66-86. For ordering information, see Alderfer (1969) above.

Pedersen, K. George. "Improving Teacher Effectiveness." *Education Canada*, 15, 3 (Fall 1975), pp. 12-20. EJ 133 941. UMI $6.00.

Porter, Lyman W., and Lawler, Edward E. III. "What Job Attitudes Tell About Motivation." *Harvard Business Review*, 46, 1 (January-February 1968), pp. 118-26. Subscription Service Dept., P.O. Box 9730, Greenwich, CT 06835.

Quinn, Timothy G. "Providing Leadership for Teacher Motivation. The Practitioner," Vol. 5, No. 2. Reston, Virginia: 1978. 13 pages. ED 165 266. NASSP, 1904 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091. $0.50.

Salancik, Gerald R., and Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "An Examination of Need-Satisfaction Models of Job Attitudes." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 3 (September 1977), pp. 427-56. EJ 167 791. UMI $4.00.

Schmuck, Patricia, and others. *Management Implications of Team Teaching*. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977. 97 pages. ED 137 906 MF $0.83 HC $4.67.

Schmuck, Richard A.; Runkel, Philip J.; Arends, Jane H.; and Arends, Richard T. *The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools*. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield, 1977. 590 pages. ED 163 664. Mayfield Publishing Company, 285 Hamilton Ave., Palo Alto, CA 94301. $16.95.

Schmuck, Richard A., and Schmuck, Patricia A. *Group Processes in the Classroom*. 2d ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1975. 229 pages. ED 137 166. Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 2460 Kerper Blvd., Dubuque, IA 52001. $6.95.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5, 1 (May 1967), pp. 66-82. UMI $6.00.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Financial Incentives and Teacher Accountability: Are We Paying for the Wrong Thing?" *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 11, 2 (Spring 1975), pp. 112-15. EJ 119 199. UMI $6.00.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "The Odyssey of Organizational Theory and Implications for Humanizing Education." In *Humanistic Education:*

Visions and Realities, edited by Richard H. Weller, pp. 197-231. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1977. 377 pages. ED 145 536. McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 2526 Grove St., Berkeley, CA 94704. $11.50.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Elliott, David L. *Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975. Prentice Hall, Inc., Publishers, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632. $12.95.

Spuck, Dennis W. "Reward Structures in the Public High School." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 10, 1 (Winter 1974), pp. 18-34. EJ 092 744. UMI $6.00.

Stephens, Thomas. "Innovative Teaching Practices: Their Relation to System Norms and Rewards." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 10, 1 (Winter 1974), pp. 35-43. EJ 092 745. UMI $6.00.

Templeton, Ian. *Differentiated Staffing*. NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, Number 6. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number 8. Arlington, Virginia; and Eugene: National Association of Elementary School Principals; and ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1974. 31 pages. ED 095 608 MF $0.83 HC $2.06.

Thurman, J.E. "Job Satisfaction: An International Overview." *International Labour Review*, 117, 3 (November-December 1977), pp. 249-67. ILO Publications, International Labour Office, CH-1211 Geneva 22, Switzerland.

Vernon, M.D. *Human Motivation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. Cambridge University Press, 510 North Ave., New Rochelle, NY 10801. $5.95, paper. $16.95, cloth.

Wahba, Mahmoud A., and Bridwell, Lawrence G. "Maslow Reconsidered: A Review of Research on the Need Hierarchy Theory." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 2 (April 1976), pp. 212-40. For ordering information, see Alderfer (1969) above.

Wolf, Martin G. "Need Gratification Theory: A Theoretical Reformulation of Job Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction and Job Motivation." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 1, Part 1 (February 1970), pp. 87-94. UMI $6.00.

Yeakey, Carol Camp, and Johnston, Gladys Styles. "The Psychological Motivation of the School Principal." *Planning & Changing*, 8, 2-3 (Summer-Fall 1977), pp. 151-65. EJ 169 805. UMI $4.00.

INTERVIEWS

Bowe, Charles, principal, Hood River Valley High School, Hood River School District No. 1, Oregon. Telephone interview, May 15, 1978.

Burr, Ann, teacher, Eastside Elementary School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, May 3, 1978.

Callan, Mary Frances, organization-staff development specialist, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, May 1, 1978.

Hall, Leland, teacher, Willamette High School, Bethel School District No. 52, Oregon; president-elect, Oregon Education Association. Interview, April 24, 1978.

Hanes, Heloise, teacher, Malabon Elementary School, Bethel School District No. 52, Oregon. Interview, May 10, 1978.

Harris, Martha, curriculum specialist, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, May 3, 1978.

Jackson, Don, principal, South Eugene High School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, April 25, 1978.

Keirnes, Barbara, principal (on leave), Edgewood Elementary School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interviews, April 17 and 26, 1978.

Mattson, Robert, professor, Center for Educational Policy and Management and College of Education, University of Oregon. Interview, May 8, 1978.

Schmuck, Richard, professor, Center for Educational Policy and Management and College of Education, University of Oregon. Interview, April 18, 1978.

Schwartzrock, Herman, principal, Condon and Magnet Arts Elementary Schools, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, April 17, 1978.

Simmons, Bert, principal, North Eugene High School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, April 19, 1978.

Sorensen, Elton, principal, Kennedy Junior High School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, April 20, 1978.

Tangedahl, Jim, principal, Westside Senior High School, Omaha School District No. 66, Nebraska. Telephone interview, May 4, 1978.

Templeman, Brad, principal, Sheldon High School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, April 18, 1978.

Turner, Stan, teacher, South Eugene High School, Eugene School District No. 4J, Oregon. Interview, April 26, 1978.